



## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

September 14, 1998

### **H.R. 3069**

#### **Advisory Council on California Indian Policy Extension Act of 1997**

*As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on July 29, 1998*

#### **SUMMARY**

H.R. 3069, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, contains two provisions. One would delay the termination date of the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy (ACCIP) until March 31, 2000, and would expand the duties of the council. The other provision would allow the Ketchikan Indian Corporation of Alaska to use a former Coast Guard facility to provide health care services.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 3069 would have no significant impact on the federal budget. Because enacting the bill would affect direct spending and receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply, but we estimate that any such effects would be insignificant. The legislation contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

#### **ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

##### **Advisory Council on California Indian Policy**

Current law authorizes the ACCIP to operate until 180 days after it has submitted a report, made recommendations, and provided certain information to the Congress and to the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services. Because the council completed these reporting requirements on September 30, 1997, its operating authority terminated under current law at the end of March 1998. H.R. 3069 would extend the authority of the ACCIP to operate until March 31, 2000, and expand the duties of the council.

Current law authorizes the appropriation of \$700,000 for the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy. H.R. 3069 would not amend that authorization. The total amount authorized has already been appropriated for the council, and according to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the council has spent nearly all of its allotted funds. Based on information from BIA, CBO estimates that continued operation of the ACCIP would cost an additional \$100,000 a year for the next two years, subject to appropriation of the necessary amounts.

The ACCIP can accept and spend private donations. Donations collected under this authority count as governmental receipts, and their expenditure counts as direct spending. By extending the authority of the council to operate until March 31, 2000, H.R. 3069 also would extend the council's authority to accept and spend donations. CBO estimates that any new collections of receipts would be insignificant.

### **Ketchikan Indian Corporation**

Current law prohibits the Ketchikan Indian Corporation of Alaska from using a former Coast Guard property that was conveyed to them in 1996 for the provision of certain health programs funded by the Indian Health Service. H.R. 3069, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, would remove this restriction. The change would not affect the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Indian Health Service, or any other federal program.

### **PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS**

Section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. H.R. 3069 could affect both direct spending and receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. CBO estimates, however, that any changes in receipts from donations to the ACCIP and consequent changes in direct spending would both be insignificant.

### **INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE-SECTOR IMPACT**

H.R. 3069 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

## **PREVIOUS CBO ESTIMATE**

On April 13, 1998, CBO provided an estimate for H.R. 3069 as ordered reported by the House Committee on Resources on March 24, 1998. The two versions of the provision affecting the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy are the same. The House version did not contain the provision affecting the Ketchikan Indian Corporation property.

## **ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:**

Victoria V. Heid and Dorothy Rosenbaum

## **ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:**

Paul N. Van de Water  
Assistant Director for Budget Analysis